

Applicants : Andrew R. Reading et al.
Serial No. : 09/911,836
Page : 10

REMARKS

The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the recent Office Action. Enclosed herewith is a petition and fee for a two-month extension of time in order to extend the response due date to March 24, 2003. Accordingly, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-58 are pending in the application. Claims 1-18 and 44-58 were withdrawn from consideration as directed to non-elected claims. Claims 19-43 were examined and were rejected on grounds that will be discussed below. By this amendment, claims 44-49 are amended to be dependent upon claim 19. New claims 59-78 are added, which are also dependent upon claim 19. Claims 1-18 and 50-58 are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 19-49 and 59-78 remain in the application and all are at issue. Reconsideration is requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the terms "lateral" and "longitudinal" were considered to be indefinite. Claim 21 is amended to remove reference to said terms. Accordingly, the basis for the rejection has been overcome. Withdrawal is requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 19-43 were rejected over various combinations of Breton WO 99/35480 (Breton 1), Tripathi et al. (Tripathi), Ensfield et al. EP 1 176 412 (Ensfield), Breton United States Patent 6,148,656 (Breton 2), and Mathews et al. (Mathews). Applicants traverse the rejection on the basis that the combined teachings of the cited references fail to disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of claim 19. The remaining claims at issue are all dependent on claim 19 and thereby incorporate therein by reference all of the elements thereof. In order to expedite prosecution, claim 19 is amended herein as follows:

Applicants : Andrew R. Reading et al.
 Serial No. : 09/911,836
 Page : 11

19. A vehicular gas emission analyzer assembly for traveling with a vehicle, comprising:

a gas analyzer system having at least two analyzer components, one of said analyzer components operating at a particular temperature and another of said analyzer components operating at an elevated temperature that is higher than said particular temperature, said gas analyzer system adapted to measure at least one emission parameter from an internal combustion engine, said at least one emission parameter chosen from (i) concentration of at least one exhaust gas, (ii) mass of at least one exhaust gas, (iii) concentration of exhaust particulate matter; and (iv) mass of exhaust particulate matter; and

a housing for said gas analyzer system, said housing adapted to travel with a vehicle wherein said housing defines multiple at least two internal zones, said at least two internal zones commonly enclosed by said housing, one of said analyzer components being in one of said internal zones and the other of said analyzer components being in another of said internal zones wherein each of said at least two zones being at a different operating temperature temperatures.

The Office Action recognizes that Breton 1 fails to disclose, teach or render obvious multiple differently heated zones or use of a zirconia sensor. However, the Examiner uses the zirconia sensor of Tripathi in Breton 1. Tripathi discloses a zirconium oxygen sensor which operates at an elevated temperature, but does not disclose that the sensor is in one internal zone with another analyzer component in another internal zone at a different operating temperature, the two internal zones commonly enclosed by a housing. Therefore, even if Tripathi is combined with Breton 1, there is no teaching of two internal zones commonly enclosed by a housing, the at least two zones being at different operating

Applicants : Andrew R. Reading et al.
Serial No. : 09/911,836
Page : 12

temperatures. It is further submitted that there is no motivation in the art for combining Tripathi with Breton 1.

Nor do the other references make up for that which is missing from Breton 1 and Tripathi. Ensfield is a corresponding European patent application which claims priority from the same documents the present application claims priority from. Accordingly, Ensfield et al. is not a proper reference to the application. It is submitted that neither Breton 2, Mathews nor Bandurski et al. disclose multiple differently heated zones.

Because the combined teachings of the prior art appears to disclose, teach, or render obvious the unique subject matter covered by the claims at issue, it is submitted that the basis for the rejection has been overcome. Withdrawal is requested.


The undersigned wishes to discuss with Examiner Politzer the issues raised in the Office Action during our upcoming personal interview scheduled for April 2, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREW R. READING ET AL.

By: Van Dyke, Gardner, Linn
& Burkhardt, LLP

Dated: March 24, 2003.



Frederick S. Burkhardt
Registration No. 29 288
2851 Charlevoix Drive, S.E., Suite 207
Post Office Box 888695
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49588-8695
(616) 975-5500

FSB:djr
SEN01 P-338A